

1 SARA B. BRODY (Bar No. 130222)  
2 CAROL LYNN THOMPSON (Bar No. 148079)  
3 MONICA PATEL (Bar No. 220825)  
4 MATTHEW D. THURLOW (Bar No. 243470)  
5 HELLER EHRMAN LLP  
6 333 Bush Street  
7 San Francisco, CA 94104-2878  
8 Telephone: (415) 772-6000  
9 Facsimile: (415) 772-6268  
10 Sara.Brody@hellerehrman.com  
11 CarolLynn.Thompson@hellerehrman.com  
12 Monica.Patel@hellerehrman.com  
13 Matthew.Thurlow@hellerehrman.com

14 Attorneys for Defendants  
15 SONIC SOLUTIONS, DAVID C. HABIGER,  
16 ROBERT J. DORIS, A. CLAY LEIGHTON,  
17 MARY C. SAUER, MARK ELY, ROBERT M. GREBER,  
18 PETER J. MARGUGLIO and R. WARREN LANGLEY

19 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
20 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

21 CITY OF WESTLAND POLICE AND FIRE  
22 RETIREMENT SYSTEM AND PLYMOUTH  
23 COUNTY RETIREMENT SYSTEM, On Behalf of  
24 Itself and All Others Similarly Situated,

25 Plaintiff,

26 v.

27 SONIC SOLUTIONS, DAVID C. HABIGER,  
28 ROBERT J. DORIS, A. CLAY LEIGHTON,  
29 MARY C. SAUER, MARK ELY, ROBERT M.  
30 GREBER, PETER J. MARGUGLIO and R.  
31 WARREN LANGLEY,

32 Defendants.

Case No.: C 07 5111(JSW)

CLASS ACTION

**STIPULATION AND [PROPOSED]  
ORDER RE BRIEFING SCHEDULE  
AND ENLARGEMENT OF PAGE  
LIMITATIONS**

The Honorable Jeffrey S. White

WHEREAS, Lead Plaintiffs, City of Westland Police and Fire Retirement System  
and Plymouth County Retirement System (collectively "Lead Plaintiffs"), have filed a Consolidated

1 Class Action Complaint (the “Complaint”), asserting claims against defendants Sonic Solutions  
2 (“Sonic Solutions”), David C. Habiger, Robert J. Doris, A. Clay Leighton, Mary C. Sauer, Mark  
3 Ely, Robert M. Greber, Peter J. Marguglio, and R. Warren Langley (collectively “Defendants”);

4 WHEREAS, pursuant to the Court’s February 27, 2008 Order, Defendants’ motion  
5 to dismiss the Complaint is currently due on May 5, 2008;

6 WHEREAS, the Complaint is 71 pages in length, includes 217 numbered  
7 paragraphs, incorporates by reference over 150 pages of supporting materials, and raises numerous  
8 legal issues concerning multiple aspects of Sonic Solutions’ business;

9 WHEREAS, Defendants requested and Lead Plaintiffs agreed, after meeting and  
10 conferring, that judicial economy will be served by the entry of an amended schedule for the filing  
11 of Defendants’ motion to dismiss the Complaint;

12 WHEREAS, under Civil Local Rule 7-2(b), the page limit for a motion and  
13 supporting papers is 25 pages;

14 WHEREAS, under Civil Local Rules 7-4(b), the page limit for opposition papers is  
15 25 pages and the page limit for reply papers is 15 pages;

16 WHEREAS, in light of the length and scope of the Complaint and the complexity of  
17 the issues raised concerning Sonic Solutions’ business, the parties have agreed that the page limit  
18 for the papers filed in support, opposition, and reply to the motion to dismiss the Complaint should  
19 be enlarged as set forth below.

20 IT IS HEREBY STIPULATED AND AGREED, BY AND AMONG THE  
21 UNDERSIGNED, ON BEHALF OF THEIR RESPECTIVE CLIENTS, SUBJECT TO COURT  
22 APPROVAL, AS FOLLOWS:

23 1. Defendants shall file and serve answers or otherwise respond to the  
24 Complaint by May 23, 2008. In the event that Defendants file and serve any motion directed at the  
25 Complaint, Lead Plaintiffs shall file and serve an opposition by July 18, 2008. If Defendants file  
26 and serve a reply to Lead Plaintiffs’ opposition, they will do so by August 8, 2008. Subject to the  
27 Court’s approval, the hearing on any motion directed at the Complaint will be set for August 22,  
28 2008.

2. In the event that Defendants move to dismiss the Complaint and file an omnibus brief in support thereof, the following page limits shall apply to the memoranda of points and authorities filed in support, opposition or reply to the motion to dismiss the Complaint:

Defendants' brief: 35 pages

Lead Plaintiffs' opposition brief: 35 pages

Defendants' reply brief: 20 pages

Such page limits do not include the table of contents or the table of authorities.

3. By executing this Stipulation, the parties have not waived and expressly retain all claims, defenses and arguments whether procedural, substantive or otherwise, and are without prejudice to any subsequent motion to stay this action, and this Order is entered without prejudice to the rights of any party to apply for a modification of this Order for good cause.

**IT IS SO STIPULATED AND AGREED.**

Dated: April 21, 2008

HELLER EHRMAN LLP

By: /s/ Monica Patel  
Monica Patel  
Attorneys for Defendants  
SONIC SOLUTIONS, DAVID C. HABIGER,  
ROBERT J. DORIS, A. CLAY LEIGHTON, MARY  
C. SAUER, MARK ELY, ROBERT M. GREBER,  
PETER J. MARGUGLIO & R. WARREN LANGLEY

*I, Monica Patel, am the ECF user whose ID and password are being used to file this Stipulation and [Proposed] Order Re Briefing Schedule and Enlargement of Page Limitations. In compliance with General Order 45, X.B., I hereby attest that Christopher M. Wood of Coughlin Stoia Geller Rudman & Robbins LLP has concurred in this filing.*

Dated: April 21, 2008

COUGHLIN STOIA GELLER RUDMAN &  
ROBBINS LLP  
LABATON SUCHAROW LLP

By: /s/ Christopher M. Wood  
Christopher M. Wood  
Co-Lead Counsel for Plaintiffs

\* \* \*

**ORDER**

PURSUANT TO STIPULATION, THE FOLLOWING IS SO ORDERED:

1. Defendants shall file and serve answers or otherwise respond to the Complaint by May 23, 2008. In the event that Defendants file and serve any motion directed at the Complaint, Lead Plaintiffs shall file and serve an opposition by July 18, 2008. If Defendants file and serve a reply to Lead Plaintiffs' opposition, they will do so by August 8, 2008. The hearing on any motion directed at the Complaint will be set for August 22, 2008.

2. In the event that Defendants move to dismiss the Complaint and file an omnibus brief in support thereof, the following page limits shall apply to the memoranda of points and authorities filed in support, opposition or reply to the motion to dismiss the Complaint:

Defendants' brief: 35 pages

Lead Plaintiffs' opposition brief: 35 pages

Defendants' reply brief: 20 pages

Such page limits do not include the table of contents or the table of authorities.

3. The parties have not waived and expressly retain all claims, defenses and arguments whether procedural, substantive or otherwise, and are without prejudice to any subsequent motion to stay this action, and this Order is entered without prejudice to the rights of any party to apply for a modification of this Order for good cause.

DATED: \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_  
The Hon. Jeffrey S. White  
United States District Judge